1968

The booth on the elizabethan public stage

Joseph Robert Little
Lehigh University

THE BOOTH ON THE ELIZABETHAN PUBLIC STAGE

by

Joseph Robert Little

ABSTRACT

In many Elizabethan plays there appear stage directions calling for various shops, tents, caves, and arbours. These direction, coupled with the astonishing repertorial rate of the Elizabethan companies, have led scholars to conclude that a special playing area for interior scenes was an integral part of the Elizabethan public stage. Since many of these same stage directions also call for a curtain or a "discovery", scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries assumed that the Elizabethan public theatre had a curtained recess in the tiring house wall and consigned all interior scenes to this upstage alcove. However, starting about 1940, this theory came under attack, for practical theatrical experiments showed that the alcove resulted in the interior action, which was often climactic, being too far removed from the audience to be dramatically effective. Since a standard space for interior scenes was still needed, a way had to be found to bring this space closer to the audience. The result was that practical men of the theatre saw that an outset booth and not a recess was the only way to stage these scenes effectively. However, none of these more pragmatic men have adequately

examined the contemporary evidence pointing toward a booth on the Elizabethan public stage. A reexamination of the stage directions, texts, woodcuts, allusions, and traditions that critics have been citing as proof for the alcove shows that a recess is not necessarily indicated. In fact, this evidence points more towards a outset booth than towards a recess. However, the exact physical dimensions of the booth, its position on the stage, and the possibility of action on its top can only be conjectured. Nevertheless, a booth six by six by six, positioned in front of one of the stage doors, and with at least some scenes staged on its top has the advantages of good sight lines, convenience, and tradition.

THE BOOTH ON THE ELIZABETHAN PUBLIC STAGE

by

Joseph Robert Little

A THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Faculty

of Lehigh University

in candidacy for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

English

Lehigh University

1968

This thesis is accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Frank S. Hook
Professor in Charge

September 16, 1965
Date

J. Burke Severs
Head of the Department of English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

In many Elizabethan plays there appear stage directions calling for various shops, tents, caves, and arbours. These directions, coupled with the astonishing repertorial rate of the Elizabethan companies, have led scholars to conclude that a special playing area for interior scenes was an integral part of the Elizabethan public stage. Since many of these same stage directions also call for a curtain or a "discovery", scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries assumed that the Elizabethan public theatre had a curtained recess in the tiring house wall and consigned all interior scenes to this upstage alcove. However, starting about 1940, this theory came under attack, for practical theatrical experiments showed that the alcove resulted in the interior action, which was often climactic, being too far removed from the audience to be dramatically effective. Since a standard space for interior scenes was still needed, a way had to be found to bring this space closer to the audience. The result was that practical men of the theatre saw that an outset booth and not a recess was the only way to stage these scenes effectively. However, none of these more pragmatic men have adequately examined the contemporary evidence pointing toward a booth on the Elizabethan public stage. A reexamination of the stage directions, texts, woodcuts, allusions, and

traditions that critics have been citing as proof for the alcove shows that a recess is not necessarily indicated. In fact, this evidence points more towards a outset booth than towards a recess. However, the exact physical dimensions of the booth, its position on the stage, and the possibility of action on its top can only be conjectured. Nevertheless, a booth six by six by six, positioned in front of one of the stage doors, and with at least some scenes staged on its top has the advantages of good sight lines, convenience, and tradition.

INTRODUCTION

In recent times scholars have posited the existence of some sort of framework on the Elizabethan public stage as a replacement for the previously unquestioned alcove or inner stage. However, these critics, principally Reynolds, Nicholl, Nagler, Hodges, and Hotson, have not exhausted all the evidence pointing toward the existence of such a framework. Furthermore, they disagree on the physical dimensions of this framework and its position on the stage. My position in this paper is that this framework or booth was probably about six by six by six, and that it was placed in front of one of the doors in the wall of the Elizabethan theatre's tiring house. It is impossible to arrive at more than likelihoods and approximations in this study. The reason for this lack of certitude is that the evidence is notoriously slippery. In chapter one I will discuss the major pieces of evidence that are available to scholars in this field. Once the nature of the evidence has been established, I will devote the remainder of the chapter to a discussion of those structural features of the Elizabethan stage vital to an analysis of the booth - the doors, the height of the balcony and the depth of the stage. In chapter two, I will analyze the proof critics have offered for the alcove and will present the case for the booth. Finally,

in chapter three I will discuss the possible dimensions of the booth and its position on the stage in light of the evidence presented in the first two chapters.

CHAPTER ONE

Some indication of just how slippery evidence concerning the Elizabethan public theatre can be is seen by juxtaposing two engravings of Elizabethan London that have survived. While all critics agree that most public theatres were roughly circular, the Visscher engraving (1616) shows the Globe quite clearly as a polygon; on the other hand, Norden's view of Bankside shows the same theatre as a true circle.[1] Obviously, one of the two is in error, or the artists are presenting only a stylized picture.

When one turns to the various pictures purporting to show the interior of theatres, which is the primary concern of this chapter, he finds that the problems of trustworthiness are increased. Six pieces of evidence have survived, but in none of these is there clear and sufficient authority.

Only one pictorial representation of the interior of a public theatre has been found.[2] John de Witt, a Dutchman, visited England about 1596 and left a record of his impressions in his Observationes Londinenses. His description of London theatres included a drawing of the interior of the Swan. Unfortunately, de Witt's manuscript was lost, and all that remains is a copy of some of his observations and the drawing in the commonplace book of his schoolmate, Arend van Buchell. This history raises two vital questions.

First, did de Witt draw the scene on the spot or from memory? Second, How accurate is van Buchell's copy? The answer to the first is impossible to determine since de Witt's travels cannot be accurately traced.[3] So far as the second is concerned, one can not have much faith in the draughtsmanship of the author, for only a cursory glance at the two stage doors and the varying heights of the galleries as they meet the tiring house shows just how primitive the perspective is in this picture. Therefore, one cannot place much credence in this drawing as evidence. Yet it is the only piece of pictorial evidence from a contemporary source that has been thus far discovered, and as C. Walter Hodges says, "If we differ from it (as most reconstructions do, to some extent) it can only be either because we believe in the variability of the playhouses one from another, or else because we consider the picture faulty in some detail or other in draughtsmanship."[4] It is an indisputable fact that playhouses differed from one another as will be seen in my discussion of the Fortune and Hope contracts, and, as mentioned above, good draughtsmanship is sadly lacking in this picture.

The second and third pieces of pictorial evidence are the woodcuts on the title pages of <u>The Tragedy of Messallina</u> (1640 and <u>Roxana</u> (1632).[5] Both these cuts depict what critics agree are indoor performances; hence, there can be only a tenuous connection with the outdoor performances of

the public stage. Furthermore, stylization or perhaps faulty draughtsmanship makes these pictures less than trustworthy as evidence.

The fourth piece of pictorial evidence, the frontispiece to The Wits; or Sport Upon Sport (1672), is open to the same objections, for it shows an indoor performance and its perspective is faulty.[6] Furthermore, it is from the Restoration rather than the Elizabethan period.

The last two pieces of pictorial evidence are the woodcuts on the title pages of Swenam, the Woman-Hater (1620) and The Spanish Tragedy (1633). The former purports to show the stage of the Red Bull theatre, but problems arise from what it does not show: most notably, the tree called for in the scene and any doors.[7] Furthermore, Thorndike has discovered that the line placing this title page at the Red Bull was not added until 1809.[8] The woodcut on the title page from The Spanish Tragedy, does not represent any particular stage at all, for there is a total lack of background.[9]

In short, then, the best piece of pictorial evidence showing the interior of a theatre seems to be the De Witt drawing, and even this is open to grave reservations.

The next two pieces of evidence available to scholars in this field are the contracts with the builders of the Fortune and Hope theatres.[10] Unfortunately, these documents provide questionable evidence, for they represent what are

believed to be atypical playhouses. While engravings and internal evidence from the plays establish that most playhouses were roughly circular, the Fortune was rectangular. Similarly, the Hope was unusual in having a removal stage and tiring house, whereas there is no direct evidence that other theatres incorporated this feature. Furthermore, these contracts do not really say much about the stage itself. Instead, the Fortune contract requires "the saide Stadge to be in all other proporcions contryved and fashioned like vnto the Stadge of the saide Plaie howse called the Globe."[11] Likewise, the Hope, except for the removable stage and tiring house, is to be built "of suche large compasse, fforme, widenes, and height as the Plaie house called the Swan."[12] Hence, little about the stage itself can be established from these contracts; however, they will be helpful later when the height of the galleries has to be established.

Since documentary and pictorial evidence is of questionable value, scholars are forced to use the plays themselves, particularly the stage directions. Unfortunately, critics basing their arguments on the same directions have many times directly contradicted on another! Even such a simple direction as "enter" may have more than one meaning. As early as 1635, Thorndike pointed this out:

> 'Enter' is often used in a conventional way when actors were manifestly discovered. . . The terms 'set forth,' 'thrust out,' 'set out' applied to beds and other properties are sometimes used merely

> referring to the placing of properties on the inner-stage to be disclosed by the opening of curtains. . . In other cases, however, these conventionalized terms. . .clearly imply definite action to the front stage.[13]

Seven years before, Harley Granville-Barker had pointed out another reason why these terms may be inconsistent:

> "each prompter will make his book more or less to his own liking"; a stage direction "may therefore contain many reminders to the actors of the meaning or treatment of scenes; and these may be written in terms of <u>effect</u>."[14] In other words, "if a character appeared on the platform holding a book and candle he had 'entered in his study'."[15] George Reynolds adds to Granville-Barker's arguments when he states that stage directions

> may have been written by one or more of the following persons: the playwright, the stage manager, or an editor preparing the plays for readers. The playwright, intent on his story, might very naturally phrase them in dramatic terms designating the balcony as "the wall," "the tower," knowing that the stage manager would translate them into theatrical fact. The stage manager might not bother to rewrite such directions, but if he inserted any himself, would be likely to phrase them quite practically; for instance, <u>Bussy Dambois</u>, with "Table, chessboard, and tapers behind the arras" some sixty lines before they are needed leaves no doubt that table, chessboard, and arras were actually to be used. . . An editor. . .conceivably could have inserted dramatic directions for the assistance of readers.[16]

A final problem in using stage directions as evidence is that a play may have been produced at different places and at intervals of quite a few years. In these cases which performances do the stage directions reflect?

If trying to establish the credibility of stage directions seems hazardous, basing arguments on the texts of

the plays themselves is, if anything, more dangerous. Many critics, most notably E. K. Chambers, have fallen into the trap of literalism. Because something is mentioned in the dialogue, it does not necessarily follow that it is physically present on the stage. In fact, many times the characters "protest too much." As Reynolds says, "the fuller the description the less likely it is to have been actually carried out."[17] A case in point is found in The Two Noble Ladies, printed from "a manuscript used by the prompter at the Red Bull, where the play was given between 1619 and 1623 by the Revels company."[18] Thus this play was given in the period that this paper is concerned with and was performed, as far as can be reasonably established, only at a public theatre. Furthermore, since it was printed from a prompt copy, the stage directions are likely to reflect actual stage practice. In Act III, scene iii there is much mention of a river in which two soldiers are drowned. Chambers would be forced into a detailed description of how this difficult feat was accomplished on stage. However, as Reynolds states:

> How it was actually managed is shown by the prosaically practical stage directions. When the soldiers exclaim, "what strange noise is this," "Dispatch the tide swells high," the directions read, "Thunder Enter 2 Tritons with silver trumpets;" and when one soldier says, "What feind is this," the direction explains, "The tritons ceaz the souldiers;" and when they say they are "hurried headlong to the streame," the direction is "the Tritons dragge them in sounding their trumpets".[19]

The "in" quite obviously refers to off-stage. Hence, when working from evidence within the plays the scholar must oftentimes use his own critical judgement, and subjective judgement is no replacement for good authority.

It would seem then that all the direct evidence concerning the public theatre - pictures, contracts, stage directions, and texts - is open to doubt or varied interpretation. Other kinds of evidence are sometimes used by scholars to support their theories about the structure of the Elizabethan stage. Some of these will be considered in detail later; here it will suffice to provide a brief summary.

The first type of evidence consists of allusions to the public stage found in works other than the plays themselves. However, in each case there is some difficulty of interpretation - inconsistency in the work itself, extreme vagueness, or grammatical confusion being the most common.

Scholars have sometimes based their theories about what the Elizabethan stage looked like on some tradition which they assume to lie in the background. It is assumed that the public theatres took the shape they did because of the kind of stages the actors had been used to playing on before the theatres were built. Unfortunately there is no way of proving the truth of the assumption, and even granting it, one cannot be sure just which of several possible predecessors the Elizabethan stage was modeled upon.

Some have argued that the stage was shaped by the tradition of playing on a raised platform at the screen end of the Tudor hall. Glynne Wickham has traced this presumed evolutionary process in great detail.[20] However, the only definite conclusion is that the doors and balcony of the public stage are derived from the hall. Anything more detailed assumes a consistency in the hall stage which did not exist.

Another tradition possibly affecting the public stage is the booth stage used by strolling players, "a fairly high platform with some sort of curtained booth at the back from which players came and possibly a canopy above, but otherwise generally innocent of further elaboration."[21] Unfortunately, while the engravings and illustrations of these stages include examples from the sixteenth century, none depicting an English stage has survived.[22]

The last tradition possibly affecting the public stage is the house or mansion, a standard feature of the medieval stage carried over into the pageants of Elizabethan times, consisting of a three-dimensional framework covered with painted canvas.[23] Furthermore, Leslie Hotson has definitely established that mansions were used in private performances at various colleges.[24] Similarly, a glance at the Revels Account establishes beyond doubt the existence of houses at court performances. Houses are mentioned again and again in this work: "sparres to make frames for the players howses . . . canvas to cover divers townes and

howses . . . hoopes for th' arbour and topp of an howse."[25] Needless to say, a tradition carried over into private and court performance does not necessarily mean that the same tradition was carried over into public performance, for the players were under no obligation always to stage plays the same way.

The last bit of indirect evidenee is perhaps the best. Henslowe's well-known Book of the Inventory of the goods of my Lord Admeralles men and scattered references from his diary establish that three-dimensional structures were used on the public stage.[26] However there are a number of curious duplications and omissions that need a great deal of explanation before these structures can be accepted as evidence pointing toward the booth on the public stage.

In summary, then, neither the direct evidence nor the indirect evidence can be accepted without reservation. My task in chapter two will be to show that the evidence supposedly pointing toward the existence of the alcove is blatantly in error, and the only real argument for its existence is its convenience. By the same token, the evidence for the booth is based on authority only slightly less slippery, and the only real arguments for its existence are convenience and tradition.

There is a consensus about certain general structural features of the theatre. That is, critics agree that the Elizabethan public theatre consisted of a raised stage in

an open yard with at least two doors at stage level. Also, they agree that some sort of provision was made for staging scenes at an upper level or "above." Finally, they agree that the stage was surrounded on at least three sides by raised galleries. However, ascertaining specific measurements for these structural features gives rise to great controversy. For the purposes of this thesis it is necessary to enter that controversy. The particular points at issue, because my conjectures about the booth depend upon them, are the number of doors on the stage, the height of the balcony, and the depth of the stage.

Stage directions concerning doors occur in so many plays that literally no critic denies that at least two doors were in use in Elizabethan public playhouses. Similarly, evidence from the de Witt drawing and the tradition of the Tudor hall, from which the doors were presumably derived, establishes that these doors were at one end of the stage in a wall adjacent to the stage.[27] However, there are strong indications that sometimes there were <u>three</u> doors in the public stage. First, there were "sometimes three" doors in the Tudor halls from which the doors themselves evolved.[28] Next, if there is a Roman influence at work in the Elizabethan theatre (though I cannot find any strong indication of it other than the possibility presented here), a third center entrance may have even further precedent. George Kernodle describes

this sort of classical facade as used at some productions at the Inns of Court, and these productions may have had more influence than they have heretofore been credited with.[29] However, precedent is not the only argument for a third entrance.

An examination of stage directions dealing with doors shows that the directions may be divided into four main groups: Enter at the other door, Enter at an other door, Enter by several doors, and Enter by three doors. The first group, by its general use of the definite article seems to imply only two doors, but the latter three groups seem to point to more than two doors. Of course, I am not the first to notice this, but in the past critics, with the exception of G. F. Reynolds, have tended to ignore the authority of the stage direction they quoted. In this chapter I will consider only those stage directions which almost certainly represent public performances and arrange these according to the theatre or company they are concerned with. As G. F. Reynolds has noted, there is only one play certainly performed at the Red Bull, that has the sort of stage direction which is helpful. The stage direction in the prologue of The Four Prentices is very clear, "Enter three in black clokes, at three doores."[30] Similarly, the Rose has only one direction of good authority. This appears in Patient Gressil, said in the 1603 edition to have been played by the Admiral's men.[31] Act three, scene two of this edition contains the following stage

direction, "enter Urcenye and Onophrio at several doors, and Forneze in the midst." Plays from Shakespeare's company are the most prolific in stage directions that are helpful in this regard, but the place of production they represent is not always certain. However, as Shakespeare's company did not acquire Blackfriars, a private theatre, until 1609, the following may be taken as representing public performances. First, Midsummers Night's Dream is represented as having been "publically acted."[32] The stage direction for act two, scene one reads "at an other door." Next, 3 Henry VI appears in 1595 as "sundrie times acted by the Right Honorable the Earl of Pembrooke his seruants."[33] The stage direction for act two, scene four reads also "at an other door." Furthermore, the 1609 quarto of Troilus and Cressida (Originally entered in 1603) contains a note: "As it was acted by the King's maiesties seruants at the Globe."[34] The stage direction for act four, scene one reads: "at an other door." A variant appears in the last Globe play, Selimus, which according to the 1599 edition "was played by the Queen's Maiesties Players."[35] The direction at 1.658 of this play reads "at diuerse doors."

The ambiguity in some of the above directions may indicate an author's hand, but this is not a serious objection at this point, for it at least points to the author's being familiar with more than two entrances.

Also, there are other indications that more than two doors are used on Elizabethan stages. For instance, I have not considered those stage directions that read, "Enter several waies," or "one way. . .another way" which may indicate more than two doors (see Chambers, III, 73, for more on this). Nor have I considered the stage directions from plays given at private theatres which sometimes read "middle door" (See Chambers, III, p. 132). In short, even when limited to stage directions with authority for public theatres, the case for a third door in at least some theatres is a fairly strong one.

The second structural problem is the height of the balcony. It is most convenient to divide the evidence into two parts: indications of the balcony's height above the pit and indications of its height above the stage. My first concern is to determine the height of the balcony above the ground level. Above the screen doors in at least some Tudor halls there is a balcony. Unfortunately, the height of this balcony varies in the screens that have survived. The Roxanna, Wits, and Messallina cuts are of little help, for they do not show the floor level, and any attempt to judge height by arguing from the depiction of spectators' heads as shown in the Roxanna and Wits is dangerous due to the rather primitive perspective in these pictures. The Swan drawing does show both a balcony and the ground level, but, as is the case with the above three pictures, the draughtsmanship is poor. Indeed, the

impossibility to trying to form more than a generalized picture of the Swan's interior is graphically pointed up by the fact that on the left side of the picture the bottom edge of the lowest gallery is level with the balcony, but on the right side the top edge is level with the balcony - a difference of quite a few feet. Lest the reader think I am overlooking an attempt at perspective, I should also point out that the gallery on the left side is drawn in considerably more detail than the one on the right, which makes a case for the left side of the drawing reflecting the true dimensions. However, the right stage door is slightly bigger and is drawn in more detail than the left, which seems to indicate that the right side of the drawing is to be given more credence. In short about all that can be said is that the balcony and lowest gallery seem to be <u>approximately</u> the same height. The obvious next logical step is to try to determine the height of this lowest gallery. Fortunately, there is some indication of this height, though it is not found in the Swan drawing itself.

The contract for the Hope theatre has survived and, as was mentioned, there is a connection made with the Swan. The contract specifies: "The inner principal postes of the first storie to be twelve footes in height."[36] Thus, there seems to be good evidence that in the Swan the first gallery was about twelve feet high with the balcony at approximately the same height. One may object that the Hope is an atypical

playhouse in that the contract specifies a removable stage and tiring house, whereas there is no suggestion that the Swan or any other theatre incorporated this feature. However, as the stage and tiring house are separate from the galleries, and since the contract calls for the same "compasse, fforme, widenes, and height as . . . the Swan," I feel this objection is of no real consequence. Furthermore, the gallery height of about twelve feet is confirmed by the contract of another Elizabethan public theatre.

Although the Fortune is also atypical in that it is rectangular while engravings and internal evidence establish that most playhouse are round, like the Swan, or, at least, polygons, the contract calls for the lowest gallery to be built "Twelue foote of lawfull assize in height." Allowing for a foundation of "one foot of assize att the leiste aboue the grounde," this places the top edge of the first gallery thirteen feet above the pit floor.[37] In short then, the evidence from the Swan, Hope, and Fortune seems fairly good, and the balcony would seem to be about twelve feet above the pit floor in the typical Elizabethan playhouse. However, as might be expected, difficulties arise when one tries to determine the height of the balcony above the stage itself.

Clearly, my first step must be to try to determine the height of the stage itself, for by subtracting stage height from balcony height, I <u>should</u> be able to establish the height of the balcony above the stage. At the outset I

would like to state that, in my opinion, the height of the stage is most likely to be from four to six feet or at approximately the level of the head of a standing spectator. My proofs for this height are contained in the following six paragraphs.

The first proof involves a return to the Tudor halls discussed in earlier paragraphs. In some halls that have survived the screen doors are elevated with steps leading up to them. In these cases it is logical to assume that the stage would have been built level with these doors in order to facilitate the entrances and exits of the actors. Wickham's photograph of the Guildhall at Exeter shows a screen door elevated approximately five feet above floor level.[38] Thus, the height I suggested is confirmed by indoor tradition, but it does not follow that this height was necessarily carried over to the public stage, and I cite this proof only as precedent and part of a pattern.

My next proof also comes from the indoor tradition. In The Chamberlains' Accounts at Norwich, 1534 to 1550, there appears the entry, "ii d. to ii laborers that fechyd barrells and tymber and made a scaffold then - ii d."[39] The obvious question is - how high are the "barrells"? Although there is no way to determine their exact height, I submit the following from The Oxford English Dictionary: "used as a capacity . . . 1502 - Arnold Chron. (1811) 246. The barell of soep, xxx galones. The barell of aell, xxxii galones. The barell of beer, xxxvi galones."[40] Thus, I

suggest that the "barrells" of the fifteen hundreds are likely to be quite large, and a stage height of at least four feet seems likely. I should also point out that there would be little point in raising the stage any less than four to five feet in these halls. Except for facilitating actor movement when screen doors are raised, the only purpose in raising a stage at all is to enable those spectators at a distance to see. Since Tudor halls are invariably quite long, a stage four to six feet off the ground seems most reasonable. Once again, this height may not necessarily have been carried over onto the public stage, but it is significant to note that, as with the Tudor hall, some standing spectators are at a considerable distance from the stage itself in most reconstructions of playhouses.[41]

Indeed, this indoor height seems to be carried over into the sixteen hundreds, for the title page of Roxanna (1622) and the frontispiece to The Wits (1672), both depicting what critics agree are indoor performances, clearly show the stage at the level of the spectators' heads (five to six feet), even though their perspective may be deficient in other areas. However, one should keep in mind that the cuts depict indoor performances, and their perspective in the main is poor; hence, the connection with the public stage is, once again, tenuous.

Perhaps a better indication of stage height is found in the outdoor booth stages, which imply the same condition

as the more formal public playhouses - standing spectators at a considerable distance from the stage. Some engravings and illustrations of sixteenth century outdoor stages have survived.[42] Even though they do not depict English stages, in all cases the stages are at about the level of the spectators' heads, which would make them from five to six feet high.

Next, the evidence for at least one trap door on the floor of the public stage is overwhelming, and this is perhaps the one thing all critics agree on. Indeed, John Cranford Adams finds traps scattered all over the stage.[43] A trap implies some space under the stage, and once again, a stage five to six feet off the ground seems most logical.

Finally, there is Ben Jonson's famous pun from Bartholomew Fair: "the vnderstanding Gentlemen o' the ground here, ask'd my iudgement."[44] This last seems to make the best sense when a stage of four to six feet is at hand, but, as puns are not required to make the best possible sense, this last proof is offered only as a possibility.

In short then, the evidence for the height of the stage is based mainly on tradition and convenience for spectators. However, it, at least, follows a pattern of from four to six feet, and, as this is the best evidence we have, it will have to suffice.

Since the stage is four to six feet above the ground and the balcony was established to be about twelve feet

above this same level, it remains only to subtract. It would seem that the balcony is most likely to be from six to eight feet above the stage. However likely this may seem, another look at the Swan drawing reveals a contradiction. While the balcony should be no more than eight feet above the stage, the doors in the wall under the balcony directly contradict this height. Allowing about six feet as the maximum door height (except for "great houses" the ceilings and doors are usually quite low in Elizabethan houses), the balcony appears to be ten to twelve feet above the stage. Admittedly, the faulty perspective of the Swan drawing does not make for good evidence about doors, but, faced with a lack of direct evidence, the possibility of a balcony ten to twelve feet above the stage must be taken into account.

The upshot of all this is that the balcony may be anywhere from six to twelve feet above the stage. This six foot difference in height will make quite a difference when one is discussing the staging of action "aloft."

Since I have exhausted all the direct evidence, my only recourse is to go to the plays themselves in the hope that they will, at least, point to which dimension, the minimum or the maximum, is the more likely. As might be expected, this evidence is something less than clear cut. However, assuming for the moment that the balcony is used to stage some of the "above" scenes, some very limited

speculation is possible. Battle scenes are perhaps the most rewarding. The best for my purposes at present is 1 Henry VI, a play entered in the Stationer's Register February 25, 1598.[45] This play is listed by Poel as having been presented at Newington Butts, The Curtain, The Globe, and at court.[46] Therefore, the stage direction which follows may represent conditions either of the public stage or court, even though the play itself seems much more appropriate to the public stage than to the court. Nevertheless, this play does contain an explicit stage direction which is representative of a type of action called for in battle scenes: "The French leape ore the walles in their shirts"(II. i). Any sort of leaping from or ascending to the balcony in the course of a battle would be more easily accomplished if the lower height of six feet prevailed, but mere convenience is not proof.

Another possible indication of height can be found in the amount of "cover" material that is used to enable a character to go from one level to another. Even here there is little consistency; however, I must point out that at times only two or three lines of dialogue are used as cover, and this seems to militate against the use of the higher balcony. But one cannot argue very cogently from this lack of cover because, as Warren Smith has pointed out, structures other than the balcony may have been used in such scenes.[47] Also, the plays Smith cites present a

similar problem to 1 Henry VI: the place of production is varied or not known.

In short, evidence for the height of the balcony above the stage both in surviving records and in the plays themselves is inconsistent, and the only argument that I can offer for the lower height is conveneience. Hence, in the last chapter of my paper, I must take into account that the balcony may be from a minimum of six feet to a maximum of twelve feet above the stage.

The third structural feature of the public playhouse affecting the booth is the position of the tiring house and the depth of the stage. In Early English Stages, Glynne Wickham points out that in the Fortune and Hope contracts the auditorium or "frame" and the stage and tiring house are listed separately. He also points out that the Fortune contract specifies that the tiring house be set up "within the said frame"; that is, inside the galleries. Furthermore, in the Hope contract the tiring house must be separate as it is "to be carried or taken away." The Swan drawing shows the tiring house thrust forward and separate from the galleries.[48] What Mr. Wickham has not noticed, however, is that the Fortune contract specifies only that the stage be built "to the middle of the yarde." The implications of this phrase are important, for, if the tiring house is distinct from the galleries, and the stage is built only to the middle of the yard, the tiring house must occupy part of what

has usually been considered the depth of the stage. Thus, the stage must be shallower than reconstructors have imagined (for instance, see Hodges, The Globe Restored, p. 188). In the case of the Fortune, instead of a stage 29 feet deep, there would be a depth of 29 feet minus the depth of the tiring house. True, these new dimensions may be valid only for the Fortune, but other reconstructors inevitably extend the stage to the middle of the yard, citing as precedent the Fortune contract. If the Fortune is not typical, there is no reason to suppose that the stage, in some cases, did not extend to the middle of the yard, for reasons mentioned below. Furthermore, if the contract does reflect a typical practice, the room taken up by the tiring house would cut down on the available playing room; hence, this would account for extending the stage to the middle of the pit. I confess that I am fond of this latter solution, for it effectively solves a problem which had bothered me since I first began my study of the Elizabethan stage: why would the owner of a theatre sacrifice all that room in the yard for paying customers by making the stage so very deep? Notice that in the indoor pictures the stages are not as deep as many reconstructors of the public stages have made them. The answer is, I think, that either the stages were not as deep as previously imagined, or, as seems to be borne out by the agreement of the Swan, the Fortune, and the Hope, part of the depth is taken up by the tiring house.

This combination of thrust-out tiring house and the resulting shallower stage are important to the dimensions of the booth when coupled with the resulting improvement in sight lines.[49] However, a discussion of the dimensions of the booth itself belongs more properly to the last chapter of my paper.

In summary, then, three things about the public stage must be borne in mind when discussing the booth itself: first, there are at least two doors, sometimes three, set in a wall with the stage immediately adjacent to the wall; second, the height of the balcony above the stage may vary from a minimum of six feet to a maximum of twelve feet; third, the tiring house is thrust out from and distinct from the galleries; thus, the stage is somewhat shallower than heretofore believed.

CHAPTER II

While chapter one was primarily concerned with the details of two structural features of the public stage that most certainly existed - the doors and the balcony - this chapter involves a part of the stage that is very difficult to be sure of: the closed part in the back - is it a recess or an outset booth? A number of factors have led scholars to conclude that a curtainable recess was a normal part of the Elizabethan stage. First, in many plays of the time the stage directions call for the use of some sort of curtain usually in connection with a shop, tomb, etc.. These directions are particularly significant when couched in such phrases as "discovered" or "within."[1]

Second, in the texts of the plays themselves there are elaborate descriptions of various shops, tombs, etc..[2] Since there are a great number of these descriptions in the plays, a curtained recess would be a most convenient way to stage these scenes.

Since many of the scenes calling for a curtain also involve the use of such large properties, as beds or tables, some sort of space behind the curtain seems necessary. What could be more natural to the nineteenth or twentieth century mind than to build this place into the tiring house wall! This theory seemingly gains credence by a

quick glance at the Roxana, Messallina, and Wits. In all three a curtain hangs from a balcony above the stage.

Next, critics supporting the recess theory point to a stage direction in Green's Alphonsus, King of Aragon (IV. i) which reads, "let there be a brazen Head set in the middle of the place behind the stage, out of which cast flames of fire."[3]

No less a critic than E. K. Chambers provides more fuel for this critical fire by listing some allusions to players peeping from behind the curtain. The most famous of these is from Peacham's Thalia's Banquet (1620):

> Tarlton when his head was onely seene,
> The Tire-house doore and Tapestrie between,
> Set all the multitude in such a laughter,
> The could not hold for scarce an hour after.[4]

Chambers holds for a long shallow alcove and explains the door mentioned in the above passage by stating that the curtain "extended to nearly the full depth of the tire-house." Thus Tarlton must "have gone to the end of the narrow passage behind the arras, and looked out where that was broken by one of the side doors."[5]

Earlier Charlotte Stopes had listed three more references to hangings or curtains that Chambers has neglected. These references are found in works by Jonson, Fleckno, and Cory.[6]

Perhaps the most famous of all allusions is the one from The Gull's Hornbook. Thomas Dekker advises his gull not to go out to sit on the stage until the play is ready

to begin, "for then it is time, as though you were one of the properties, or that you had dropped out of the hangings, to creep from behind the arras."[7]

The next argument is best exemplified by the opinion of Mr. Thorndike: "We can reverse the process of evolution and reconstruct the Elizabethan stage from the arrangement and method of the Restoration theatres." That is, the "picture frame stage of today" had its beginnings in the inner stage of the Elizabethan public theatre.[8]

Finally, an architectural drawing of Trinity Hall has survived along with the accounts of the Churchwardens of Botolph without Aldersgate; these accounts record that this hall was rented "to 'dyuerse players' or 'for playes' in the years 1557-8, 1558-9, 1562-3, 1564-5, 1565-6, 1566-7, 1567-8."[9] The drawing shows an area recessed under the gallery that is "7 feet 10 1/2 inches deep and 15 feet wide . . . thus providing an inner stage."[10]

At first glance, all this evidence looks most impressive; however, a closer scrutiny reveals many weaknesses, and, indeed, this closer examination of the evidence will, I think, tend to show that a booth, not a recess would be more suitable. I will treat the evidence in the order in which I have presented it.

First, as I mentioned in chapter one, stage directions are very complex things and critics basing their arguments on the same stage directions have many times directly

contradicted one another. However, two facts stand out after one has read a great number of stage directions. First, "the terms rear stage and inner stage never occur in Elizabethan texts."[11] Second, all that can be definitely established from the stage directions is that in some scenes a curtain of some sort was used, and this seems to be particularly true when the term "discovered" was used; however, even when this term is used in connection with a large property this does not necessarily require a recess in the tiring house wall. A framework covered with curtains and placed in front of one of the stage doors would serve just as well or better.

Second, as mentioned in chapter one, the more elaborate the description in the text, the more likely the object was not physically present on the stage. Furthermore, if a physical structure was used, it could just as conveniently have been a curtained framework or booth. Indeed, as I will point out in a later section of my paper, such a framework has distinct advantages over a recess in scenes requiring a shop, tomb, etc..

The next pieces of evidence that critics cite in discussing the alcove are the Roxanna, Messallina, and Wits cuts. However, these are convincing only at first glance. A close look shows that, as is common with Tudor halls, the balcony does not project over the stage; in fact, there is no room for actors to retire off stage in

the Roxana and Wits if there are no doors behind the curtains. Rather, the balcony is part of and built into the screen itself and in effect no recess exists. Indeed, the projection of the curtain in the Messallina is remarkably like a projecting booth.

The proof from the stage direction in Greene's play referring to "the place behind the stage" cannot be accepted without question, for "Of the theatrical history of the play, beyond the assertion that it had been 'bene sundrie times acted', nothing is known with any degree of certainty."[12] I might also state that the stage directions in Alphonsus, King of Aragon shows hints of the author's hand; for instance, the last stage direction before the end of the play reads: "Exit Venus. Or if you can conveniently, let a chaire come down from the top of the stage, and draw her up." Of course, the author must have had some actually existing place in mind when he wrote the direction. However, "the place behind the stage" could easily refer to the space behind one of the stage doors, for the definite article may not refer to a specific recessed playing area for effects of this sort; rather the author could easily be giving the stage manager an option as he certainly does when he says "if you can conveniently."

E. K. Chambers' quote about Tarlton's peeping seems to me to argue that there is a center door behind the curtain. Furthermore, the allusion to Tarlton's head implies only a place to enter unseen behind a curtain,

and, as with stage directions and text, there is no justification in recessing this area into a playing area, for once again, a curtained booth would also serve.

The allusions cited by Stopes are perhaps the least convincing of all, for they carry no hint of a discovery (as in the stage directions), a tomb or a shop (as might be the case in the text), or even a hint of players peeping. They are simple, unadorned statements about curtains, and more should not be read into them.

The Gull's Hornbook allusion implies only a place (perhaps a door) to enter the stage from behind the curtains; indeed, by equating the Gull with a property Dekker points to the fact that props were pushed through the curtain and on stage. Hence, a playing area, of any kind, behind this curtain may not have been the case in this theatre. In fact two pages earlier in his account, Dekker states:

> Whether therefore the gatherers of the public or private playhouse stand to receive the afternoon rent; let our gallant having paid it, advance himself to the throne of the stage; I mean not to the lords' room. . .But on the very rushes where the comedy is to dance, yea, and under the state of Cambyses himself must our feathered estrick, like a piece ordinance be planted.[13]

The question is, what is the "state of Cambyses" that the Gull is to sit under? It may be a veiled reference to the roof or "heavens" above the stage but why call such a standard feature by such a particular name? It is more likely to be a particular canopy over a throne. A

"state" or canopy consists of a framework of four poles and a cloth or wooden top; that is, it is a booth type structure with a covering over it that could be changed to fit the occasion (for instance, Cambyses' state), and under which a stage sitter could crowd himself. Hence, Dekker's Gull could enter through the arras and seat himself under a framework placed in front of it. The great advantages of such an arrangement must await a later section of my paper. However, in all fairness, I must point out that consistency is not one of Dekker's strong points. At one point in his book he advises his gallant not to enter the stage until the prologue signals the trumpets that he is ready to enter, while later on he tells his mock hero, "Before the play begins, fall to cards. . .throw the cards, having torn four or five of them, round the stage, just upon the third sound, as though you had lost."[14] Needless to say it would be difficult not to enter until the play starts, and, at the same time, be throwing cards about the stage at the third sound of the trumpets! In the light of all this, it is certainly dangerous to draw the conclusion from The Gull's Hornbook that a recess existed behind the arras.

The next piece of evidence supposedly pointing toward the existence of an inner stage is Mr. Thorndike's idea of reverse evolution. This piece of evidence I regard as extremely dangerous, for it brings nineteenth and twentieth

ideas of stagecraft to the Elizabethan theatre. The result is as Mr. Hodges says, "We try, seemingly in very spite of our better knowledge, to find some sort of proscenium somewhere upon the Elizabethan stage; to open up an inner stage no matter how questionable the evidence for its existence, and to thrust back into it a greater and greater portion of the action of Elizabethan plays."[15] A far more valid approach is to analyze the stages of the Elizabethans themselves, and, if necessary to return to the medieval stages that preceded them.

The last piece of evidence that purports to show an inner stage is the architectural drawing of Trinity Hall, and, of all the evidence, this is perhaps the best. There is no doubt that the hall was used for plays, and there can be no doubt that in this hall a recess did exist. However, it is impossible to establish what company or companies played here.[16] Furthermore, no one can even begin to conjecture what plays were given here. Since no specific play can be connected with the hall, no stage direction or text indicating the use of a curtain can be connected with the hall. Hence, there is no proof that a curtain was, in fact, hung in front of the recess; that is, there is no proof other than convenience that the recess was ever used as an inner stage. Furthermore, this recess under the gallery is rather unique, for in all other instances of Tudor halls that I have researched the gallery does not project. Hence, to argue from an

isolated instance with no supporting evidence from the plays themselves for the existence of an alcove in the public theatre strikes me as rather unsound.

In brief, then, there is no positive evidence other than convenience for a recessed playing area on the Elizabethan public stage, and, as I will shortly discuss, the booth is even more convenient than the recess, and it has the additional advantage of precedent. All that can conceivably be proved from the above evidence is that in some cases a curtain with some sort of provision for entrance behind it was sometimes used.

Before leaving the alcove and taking up the booth, I would like to point out the pragmatic evidence that positively argues against any recess. In the words of George Reynolds, "A good many modern directors have moreover found such a stage too far removed from the audience - acting there has been ineffective, sight and hearing of doings there difficult to manage. Certainly spectators in the gallery near the tiring house could see little or nothing of what was going on in it."[17] This is confirmed by the report of Bernard Miles and Josephine Wilson on the production at the Mermaid Theatre "We have learned that it is impossible to play scenes on the so-called 'inner stage' or even far up stage at all. When the expanse of platform is there to be used, you have to use it. Not to do so feels false and artificial and indeed lands us back where we are in the picture-frame theatre,

with distant and purely two dimensional acting."[18] It is interesting to note these experiments seem to bear out the speculation of G. H. Cowly in 1927:

> it was so far back from the auditorium and muted by three walls and two floors, that voices uttered within must have lost much of their resonance and were probably almost inaudible to those sitting facing the stage. If as seems probable it was illuminated only by daylight, any scenery displayed there cannot have been seen to best advantage [a possible explanation for "thrust out"] and indeed, on dull days, must have been almost invisible. Really the place within can have been little more than a wide middle door screened by an arras; and it will be found that it was the door way or the arras itself that the dramatist makes use of, and not the room behind.[19]

Of course, by making the stage shallower, ~~very~~ likely through the use of a separate tiring house, the problems of sight and hearing are to some extent diminished but by now means removed. Needless to say, action in a recess slightly closer to the audience cannot be as dramatically effective as action projected down forward and center stage. This last is the big theatrical advantage of the framework or booth, which I have been so carefully working up to. But proof of its effectiveness, which I will later document from practical theatrical experience, is not proof that such a device actually existed in the Elizabethan public theatre. Therefore, it becomes my task to present evidence that such a device was physically present on the Elizabethan public stage. In presenting this evidence I will try to be at least as demanding as I have been in considering the evidence critics have offered for the alcove.

That is, I will state the authority of the stage direction, try to analyze the texts to see if they "protest too much," and look for inconsistencies in the evidence as a whole. In discussing the evidence for the booth, I will separate the evidence into five classifications: proof from stage directions, proof from text, proof from pictures, proof from allusions, and proof from traditions.

As is the case with the alcove, the word booth does not appear in any stage direction I have found. However, although admittedly few and scattered, there are references to three dimensional booth-like structures in stage directions. Furthermore, each of these, considered by itself, might only have been a special property built for one particular play; nevertheless, taken together, they form a body of evidence pointing toward the booth-like structures on the public stage, and as such they are also important as precedent.

The closest to the booth is the framework that the Elizabethans called a "tent." Today, a better word for this structure would be pavilion, for the Elizabethan tents seem to have been "large timber frames roofed over and covered round the sides by canvas cloths ornately painted and decorated inside and out."[20] At first glance, Hodges' proof for the existence of such a structure on the public stage seems impeccable, but I cite it here only to show that one of the proofs for the existence of the booth is ill-founded. Hodges notes that the stage direction in Pericles, V,i, reads: "A pavilion on deck with a curtain

before it; Pericles within it reclined on a couch."[21] However, the only edition with real authority is Quarto one, and this direction does not appear in this quarto; in fact, it is a much later interpolation by Malone.[22]

Fortunately, a stage direction referring to a tent, and with some authority does exist. The Platt of the Secound Parte of the Seven Deadlie Sinns has long been known and has fairly good authority.[23] This stage direction reads: "A tent being plast on the stage for Henry the Sixt. He in it asleepe. To him the Lieutenant, a Purcevant, R. Cowley Jo Duke, and I Warder, R. Pallant. To them Pride, Gluttony, Wrath, and Covetousness at one dore, at another dore Envie, Sloth, and Lechery. The three put back the foure and so exeunt."[24] The large numbers of people involved in this elaborate dumb show certainly suggest a booth-like pavilion. Also, the mere fact that it is the initial direction and the fact that Henry is asleep in the tent point to its being present on the stage when the play opens; thus, it seems to function much as a booth might. There are, of course, other references to tents in stage directions, the most familiar being the two tents called for in the final act of Richard III, which I will take up later, but none have as good authority as the platt discussed above.[25]

Besides a tent there is one other structure, a tomb, that suggests a booth in two surviving stage directions. The first stage direction appears in King James the Fourth,

but its authority is only fair.[26] The direction itself reads, "Music playing within, enter Aster Oberon, King of Fairies: and ANTICS, who dance about a tomb placed conveniently on the stage; out of which suddenly starts up, as they dance, BOHAN, a Scot, attired like a ridsall man, from whom the ANTICS fly. OBERON manet."[27] As Glynne Wickham states:

> It is possible that the Antics carried this tomb with them from the tiring house, put it down on the stage and danced round it, but the wording actually used suggests that the tomb had been placed in a convenient position by the stage management before the action began. The tomb contains, besides Bohun the Scot, his two sons Nano and Slipper who make their entry upon the stage later in the scene. Thus, although the Antics could have carried the tomb, it would have been a clumsy object to handle.[28]

Of course this tomb like the tent may be a special property and not the booth at all, but the fact remains it is a three-dimensional structure, not a recess, likely to have been placed the public stage before the play began.

Another stage direction referring to a tomb can be found in the last act of Romeo and Juliet, and in this case the authority is quite good: "Romeo opens the tomb."[29] Furthermore, there is no stage direction indicating that it was ever carried on stage; thus, the possibility exists that it was used for other structures (for instance, the Friar's cell or the apothecary's shop) in the play, and localized as necessary. This, of course, is precisely the function a booth would serve, and in the case of Romeo and Juliet there is certainly a great deal of localization:

"tomb" is mentioned three times in the first seventy-three lines, not to mention "bed of death," "womb of death," and later on "Capels Monument."[30]

In short then, stage directions pointing toward the existence of a booth are only a little more convincing than those purporting to show the existence of a recess, for the directions could refer to special properties, or else the only argument is convenience.

In considering evidence from the text itself, my first proof, at least, is in no way open to the objection that the characters "protest too much." As G. F. Reynolds has pointed out, there exists certain isolated references to the curtained space in the text "which do not exactly fit the dramatic situation. Such terms suggest that the playwright as he wrote saw the stage rather than the imagined location."[31] Reynolds cites eight instances from plays presumably given at the Red Bull, but in some cases, as he tacitly admits, his authority for their having been performed there is not as strong as he would like. Rather than go into a detailed discussion of each play and its authority, I will simply reproduce Reynold's stated authority which I have checked and found valid; that is, the letter A after the titles of plays indicates plays "which we have good reason to believe were given at the Red Bull in the years we are concerned with, and whose texts may be reasonably taken as representing their performances there." The letter B indicates, "those plays which were probably, but

not solely given at the Red Bull, and also. . .those plays surely given there but whose texts may not represent Red Bull performances." Finally, the letter C points to plays "only possibly connected with the Red Bull in the years in question."[32] With this indication of authority in mind, I will reproduce here four of Reynold's instances which seem to me to point up most effectively the sort of authorial slip that indicates some sort of structure on the stage:

> is it too fanciful to suggest that there seems no dramatic reason for describing the sleeping devil discovered in If It Be Not Good, A, I. i as "cabind" unless he was in something that looked like a small room? Similarly in Sir Thomas Wyatt, B, 100-102, Suffolk describes himself as hiding in "a simple cabin" where cabin seems a curiously precise word for the scene. In Appius and Virginia (only a C play, but on this point the distinction matters less), IV.ii, a scene in a camp, a soldier asks, "Is our hut swept clean" [why not "tent" or did the actual stage influence the dramatist?]. . .Perhaps the most interesting descriptive term for the curtained space occurs in A Match At Midnight, C, E 2 V; in a tavern scene, Tim hides and the others say "Looke and he have not insconst himselfe in a wooden castle.[33]

In other words, in each of the above instances the text does not fit the fiction the play conveys; thus there is the possibility that some sort of structure, is present on the stage at least at the Red Bull. However, the problem of authority certainly weakens to some extent Reynold's argument.

There are, of course, other references to structures on the stage in various texts, some of which I shall treat in later paragraphs dealing with the possibility of more than one structure on the public stage. For the present

I will discuss what I consider to be the best proof for three-dimensional structures based on textual evidence; that is, the tent called for in 2 Tamburlaine, IV has the best authority.[34] The stage direction opening Act IV reads, "Amyras and Celebinus issues from the tent where Calyphas sits asleep." Seven lines later Amyras says, "Call forth our lazy brother from the tent." As Wickham notes, "the tent is needed throught the scene, but there is no suggestion that it is either put up as the scene begins or struck as it closes; the inference is that it is in position on the stage throughout the play and used when required."[35] However, Wickham has not noticed that in the very last line of this scene Tamburlaine says, "Come, bring them to our pavilion." In other words, here is a play for which there is good authority with a stage direction calling for a tent, and, even more significantly, one reference to a tent at the beginning of a scene and one at the end. As this is a rather long scene of two hundred and seven lines, I don't feel that the characters "protest too much." Once again the tent could be a special property or the stage manager could be writing in terms of effect, but, by this time, I begin to doubt if the sheer number of times this structure or something quite similar is called for does not indicate that it is a fairly standard structure.

Proof for the booth from the various pictures that have survived is not entirely conclusive, but, once again, three-dimensional structures are definitely shown in at

least some title pages. The Roxana and the Wits show no three-dimensional structure, but neither is there room for a recess playing area since the balcony from which the curtain is hung does not extend over the stage. On the other hand, the Messallina does show a projecting curtained space with the balcony above and behind it and not a recess. Two other title pages should be mentioned at this point: Swenam, the Woman-Hater and The Spanish Tragedy. As mentioned in chapter one, there are problems of authority with these pictures. However, in both pictures three-dimensional structures are represented; thus, even if the pictures lack the authority that critics, like myself, might wish, I feel that the artists must have been familiar with similar structures on the stages of the period. Either the artists are representing something familiar to them, or they must be credited with inventing a totally new style of staging.

The most famous proof from allusion is from Jonson's Poetaster (1602 for Blackfriars).[36] As Leslie Hotson points out:

> When the rascally Captain Tucca vows revenge, should the players satirize him on the public stage, we . .. do not find him threatening to dear down the curtains of their inner stage or to rip out the hangins of their balcony. . .But he does vow to wreck their costly scenic "mansions" and canvas "houses": "And you stage me, stinkard, your mansions shall sweat for't your tabernacles, varlets."[37]

Despite the fact the play is produced at Blackfriars, a private theatre, the connection between "mansions" and

"tabernacles" to a three-dimensional structure is, I think, obvious.

The next allusion is admittedly very general, but, as many critics make use of it, I will reproduce it here although I do not think it is worth much consideration. Fynes Moryson in reproaching some English strolling players that he saw perform at the Frankfurt Autumn Fair in 1592 says they have "nor any good Apparell, nor any ornament of the Stage."[38] What this "ornament" was is pure conjecture. Certainly, this could be an allusion to a house, a mansion, or a booth.

There remains one more allusion to be discussed; I refer to Thomas Platter's famous account of his visit to England. However, there is a grammatical problem here of which cognizance has not been taken. In his September 21, 1599 entry, Platter writes:

> On this occasion, I also saw after dinner a comedy, not far from our inn, in the suburb; if I remember right, in Bishopsgate. Here they represented various nations, with whom on each occasion an Englishman fought for his daughter, and overcame them all except the German, who won the duaghter in fight. He than sat down with him, and gave him and his servant strong drink, so that they both got drunk, and the servant threw his shoe at his master's head and they both fell asleep. Meanwhile the Englishman went into <u>die Zelten</u>, robbed the German of his gains, and thus he outwitted the German also.[39]

The sense of thesentence seems to demand a singular translation of <u>Zelten</u>, and the "tent" is the way E. K. Chambers translates it. However, the grammatical form of <u>Zelten</u> indicates the plural, "tents", and this is the way Leslie

Hotson translates it.[40] Since it is difficult to imagine how the Englishman could go into more than one tent at the same time, I tend to agree with Chambers' translation. However, I am not as convinced as C. Walter Hodges appears to be, for he has seen fit to alter the Zelten to "zelte" in his discussion of Platter's account. Hodges further states, "I offer the opinion that this passing reference to the tent, instead of to a tent, implies an accepted, more or less permanent or standard feature."[41] I would like to agree with Hodges on this point, but, because of the grammatical confusion surrounding this passage, I can feel justified in offering it only as one critic's opinion.

If the above paragraphs, considered singularly, are not wholely convincing due to the untrustworthiness of the evidence, or the interpretation that must be put on the evidence, still, considered together, they at least point out the strong possibility of three-dimensional frameworks on the public stage. Reinforcing the above arguments is a consideration of staging traditions which may have influenced staging at the Elizabethan public playhouse.

The first of these is the tradition of the strolling players booth stage. As this has been fairly well documented in chapter one, I will not retrace my steps except to point out the striking similarity in structure between this framework and the traditional medieval house or mansion, for both were three-dimensional wooden frames covered with decorative cloth.

Wickham is particularly helpful with regard to mansions. In his Early English Stages (Volumes One and Two) he reproduces various prints, engravings, paintings, and tapestries. Even more helpful are Wickham's descriptions of "The ornate, costly and skillfully made pageants of the medieval Royal Entries [that] survived in England throughout the Shakespearean era."[42] These pageants had standardization of structure and effect. That is, many different devices were constructed from a framework of four pillars. In fact, some devices became so conventional that they were often stylized or symbolized; for instance, an arbour need be no more than four pillars and some trellis work. Wickham uses this standardization of effect for organizational purposes when he describes these structures under the headings of "The Arbour; The Mountain; The Tree, The Fountain and The Cave; etc.."[43] This standardization of effect seems to be carried over into the public theatre as I will show when I return to it. Although the connection between medieval staging and the public playhouse is not fully established in my paper, there can be little doubt that mansions were used in at least some private performances. Leslie Hotson has uncovered the following:

> For plays at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1551-52 the carpenter was paid "for removing ye tables in ye haull and setting yem up agein with ye houses; pro erigendis domibus eiusdem comoediae" (Queens', 1545-46); "for makynge howses for ye players" (Trinity, 1556-57); "for making houses at the comaedie" (Corpus Christi, 1581-82); "for paynging the stage. . .for paynting the Sayleirs [i.e. the

celures on roofs of the houses]" (Trinity, 1614-15).[44]

Of course as these are all college performances, the Roman influence may be at work here; nevertheless, be it Roman or Medieval influence, the structures are the same.

The Revels Accounts establish beyond doubt the existence of houses at cour performances. As I said in chapter one, "houses" are mentioned again and again in this work: "sparres to make frames for the players howses . . .canvas to cover divers townes and howses. . .hoopes for th' arbour and topp of an howse."[45] Needless to say the wooden frame covered with canvas construction of these houses at court point up a connection between them and the various structures I have discussed above.

Finally, Henslow's well known Book of the Inventory of the goods of my Lord Admeralles men and scattered references from his diary establishes that three-dimensional structures (if not actual booths) are used on the public stage. As Glynne Wickham points out, "The scenic devices in question are all directly paralleled among the scenic emblems listed in the Revels Office Accounts and described in surviving records of the Lord Mayors' Shows."[46] Thus, a connection between the houses, mansions, and other structures with the public stage can be established. However, I find it very significant that while there is duplication of some devices in Henslowe (2 Tombs, 2 Frames, 3 Trees, etc.), there is no mention of such common devices as arbours, caves, and

tents. The lack of an arbour and tent is particularly unusual in light of the fact that both are very common devices and called for in many plays.[47] There are five possible explanations, as I see them, of these curious duplications and omissions.

First, the omission of arbours, caves, and tents can be explained by the fact that the plays the Admiral's Men presented between 1598-99 may not have required such devices; hence, Henslowe did not list them. This I regard as highly unlikely in view of the large repertories that Henslowe's companies possessed, and in view of the fact that Tamburlaine required a tent.

Second, duplication of the same device may be required because the same play required more than one such device. There are indications that, at times, more than one structure is present on the stage. Wickham in his article in TDR notes that in The Massacre at Paris, "four separate houses are presented to the audience within one hundred words of dialogue, two at least of which involve interior scenes. Such speed and complexity of stage-action is almost impossible to conceive in terms of one house."[48] However, because the title page of this play is undated, it is difficult to establish what performance or performances the text represents. The play was produced in 1593 by Strange's men and revived constantly until Henslowe's note on January 18, 1602 brings information about it to an

end.[49] There are also the two tents the dialogue and stage directions seem to require (but here the characters may protest too much) in Richard III, V.iii. Fortunately, the authority for this play is not bad.[50]

These two plays, I believe, point up sufficiently the possibility of two or more structures for one play. A full listing of such plays would involve many pages, and the problem of establishing authority would become more and more complex. Leslie Hotson in his Shakespeare's Wooden O (pp. 211 ff) discusses a number of plays in which two structures seem to be indicated, but, once again, the problem of authority makes these cases only possibilities. Also, G. F. Reynolds points out that The Devil's Law Case (which was A authority) "must be provided with an interval between III. ii and III. iii, or we must assume that there were two concealed spaces on the stage.[51] Of course, the idea of an interval makes this play once again just another possible instance of two structures. In short, the evidence from the plays establishes no more than a likelihood of two structures.

Evidence from outside the plays is, to my mind at least, more convincing. Hotson cites the discourse of Davenant on the staging of tragedy and makes much of his mention on "Two low Rooms upon a Floor." If Hotson is right in identifying the "antient Drama" of Davenant's analysis with the Elizabethan stage, then two structures

may have been much more common than is usually supposed.[52] However, while Hotson's rejection of the classical theatre as forming the basis for Davenant's description is convincing, he does not consider the possibility of the "antient Drama" referring to the medieval staging tradition where two or more houses are ordinarily the case. Of course, the medieval tradition does seem to have had a strong influence on the Elizabethan stage; thus, Hotson's case is not a bad one if this medieval connection is recognized.

In the early 1950's Richard Southern uncovered a print dating about 1629 which shows an indoor performance. Not much has been made of this print because, I suppose, it depicts what is probably a Flemish performance. However, it is important for my purposes because it shows two separate structures on the seventeenth century stage. Not only the number of structures but also their construction is significant. On the left the print shows what is obviously a booth with a ladder extending above its top. On the right there is a curved (remember "hoopes") mansion and a player is drawing its curtain "discovering" its interior. Thus, in the seventeenth century the booth and mansion tradition is carried over into indoor performances at least in the Flemish countries. I must also point out that this print parallels the Elizabethan stage as I have reconstructed it in important details. Most notably, the shallow stage is at one end of the hall and level with the heads of standing spectators, and galleries are around

three sides of the stage. The lack of a balcony and doors can be explained by the fact that this performance probably took place in a tennis court. Notice, however, that "above" scenes are provided for by the ladder in the booth. Also, the discovery scene implies a place for the character to enter the mansion unseen.[53]

Also, the well known Wagner Book description, while not concerned with an actual performance, does list the tiring house as distinct from walls, hell mouth, etc.. Thus, there is a possibility of more than one structure in this description of a seventeenth century stage.[54]

It would seem that these points establish the likelihood of at least two structures being used in some plays. However, there are other explanations of the duplication in Henslowe which are, to my mind, more convincing since the majority of Elizabethan plays can be staged with only one structure for each.

Another explanation for duplication is, as Glynne Wickham points out, that "just as the arbours or the palaces of the Lord Mayors' Shows and the Revels Office differed from each other in order that variety might be provided within a restricted convention, so too were the emblems of a public theatre varied in their external appearance from play to play within the limitation imposed upon them by their function."[55] A desire for variety may indeed be the explanation, since it effectively answers Chambers and

and Lawrence, who object that if the public companies had such devices it would have been unnecessary for the Revels to provide them. However, it seems to me a much simpler explanation is possible.

The real reason for much duplication, I feel, is that tombs and trees are special properties suited to particular plays. That is, when a play demands a prop that is either not suited to the standard booth or the producers deem it desirable to build a special prop, this prop is in fact built for that particular play. This would seem to be the best explanation for the three trees in the inventory for "one is specified as being a bay tree, another as a tree of golden apples and a third as a Tantalus tree."[56] Likewise, the tombs are listed as "1 tome of Guido" and "1 tome of Dido." Similarly, the frames called for are "1 whell and frame in the Sege of London" and "1 frame for the heading in Black Jone."[57] As most (but not all) of these props have been connected with specific plays, I feel fairly sure that my last explanation is the correct one.

However, I have still not accounted for the lack of arbours, shops, and tents. The explanation is, I think, to be found precisely in the fact that these items are so common in the plays of the time; hence, no <u>special</u> prop is built. Variety is possible in a special prop from time to time if a play calls for it, or even possible in the devices

that are used at court and colleges at the special seasons. But to expect a company to produce all new structures for each play while playing repertory at the rate of these companies is impossible. There must be some sort of standardization. I suggest that the various interior scenes, arbours, shops, and caves, if represented physically on the stage (as may not always be the case), are represented by a more or less standard framework as was traditional. Of course, I am not the first to propose this theory. Rothwell in 1959 notes that "whereas at court a number of houses might and could be provided for a play, the actors in the public theatre might have to do with one, perhaps a house or booth set up upon the stage, the appearance of which could be changed with the words of the actor or by the properties set within or about it. A neutral booth could be altered, by the addition of a tomb into a mausoleum, by the addition of a bedstead into a bedchamber, by the addition of an alter into a church."[58] A year earlier, Nagler in his discussion of medieval stage technique in the Elizabethan theatre said: "Economy and other practical considerations may indeed have led the troops to limit the number of their houses; they may have attempted to get along with two doors, a few sets, and a pavilion that could be localized as required. But this sort of tent, which could represent a study in one scene and a tavern in the next, is itself a medieval device."[59]

In short, this sort of standard semi-permanent structure would no more be listed in Henslowe's Diary than the balcony or stage itself because it is not the sort of special property that would have to be built for a specific play.

While proof for three-dimensional structures is fairly conclusive even if based on nothing more than Henslowe's list, definite proof for the neutral booth is mostly a general argument based on tradition and omission. However, granted the fact that the special properties which Henslowe lists are connected with specific plays that his company produced, an examination of these plays themselves may prove helpful. Unfortunately, not all have survived, and the authority for others is poor. Nevertheless, I feel that it is significant that the 1590 edition of 2 Tamburlaine seems to indicate the use of a tent as I have previously demonstrated, but nowhere in Henslowe is there any mention of such a device.[60] This tent, I maintain, is probably no more than the standard booth. It is interesting, though it does not prove too much, that special props, most notably a cage, do seem to have been provided for the 1598 performance of 1 Tamburlaine.[61] It would seem that if a tent is used, as the stage directions and text call for, it would be mentioned in the Diary. The fact that it is not must mean either that a tent was not used in the staging, or that the pavilion was represented by a more or less standard structure. As the authority for 2 Tamburlaine is quite good, I suggest that the latter course was followed.

In summary, there is no evidence for any recess or playing area behind the tiring house wall. So far as I have been able to determine there exists only a necessity for a place behind a curtain. This place can be within a curtained framework or booth. The evidence for the existence of such a framework based on stage directions, text, pictures, and allusions is by no means conclusive although such evidence does point to the existence of three-dimensional structures on the public stage. Arguments from medieval tradition, college and court performances establishes the existence of houses on these stages. This evidence coupled with Henslowe's Diary proves three-dimensional properties are used on the public stage, and, indeed, Henslowe's listing of special properties (most connected with specific plays), and the omission of arbours, tents, and caves argues that a standard booth framework is used for such scenes. I readily concede my main agruments for the existence of such a neutral booth are based on convenience and tradition. Yet I cannot help noting that the only possible reason for supposing the existence of an alcove is convenience in staging. However, the booth theory has the advantage of convenience as well as the sanction of tradition and the evidence for three-dimensional structures behind it.

CHAPTER III

Given a tiring house that juts forward (as established in the Swan, Fortune, and Hope), and the stage extending to the middle of the yard (as in the Fortune), I will assume the tiring house to take up about six to seven feet of the twenty-seven and one half feet usually given as the depth of the Elizabethan stage. Similarly, I will assume the booth to be placed adjacent to the tiring house wall, and its dimensions to be six feet long (across the top), six feet high, and six feet in depth. There is no proof for these dimensions (except that they reflect a minimum necessary space for staging certain key scenes). Furthermore, the booth is readily removable, and it need not be set up for plays that do not require it. When the booth is used there are two things that must be established: its position relative to the doors and the manner of portraying action on its top.

In the preceding chapter I noted that the evidence does seem to point towards some means of entering unseen behind a curtain. A proper "discovery" implies that the actors are not seen before the curtain is drawn. Thus, the booth would have to be placed in front of one of the doors. But the Swan drawing, as well as many stage directions, indicate that in some theatres there were only two stage doors. If the booth were placed before

one of the doors, how could there still be two entrances, as required by many plays? If the booth is in front of one of the two doors, the actors simply enter by the doors and localize the booth in the dialogue. If the scene needs to be played elsewhere, the actors enter, pass through the frame, and proceed to another part of the stage. Even if the booth were to be curtained in preparation for a discovery, all the actors need do is pass through the curtained framework (remember Tarleton) and proceed to another part of the stage. In short, the fact that the booth may be placed in front of one of the two doors in no way precludes that door as an entrance.

Thus far I have assumed that only two doors were available at the typical Elizabethan public theatre, for most screens and the DeWitt drawing show only two. However, the booth would be most effective if it could be positioned between two flanking doors. This arrangement necessitates a third door behind the booth. While I do not suggest that this is invariably the case (the DeWitt drawing is strong evidence that it is not), there is evidence pointing towards three doors in at least some theatre (see pp. 15-16.) In cases where a third door was available, I feel that it is reasonable to assume that the booth would be placed in front of the middle door, for such an arrangement puts the down stage side of the booth almost center stage (twenty-seven and one half feet minus seven feet for the tiring house and minus six

feet for the booth puts the down stage edge of the booth approximately fourteen feet from the edge of the stage). The advantage of this arrangement is that climactic scenes which call for an interior of some sort (the tomb scene in Romeo and Juliet and the bedroom scene in Othello), and indeed all interior scenes, are now almost center stage rather than off to one side or, still worse, stuffed into an upstage recess. Hodges reconstructs the Hope in this manner.[1] While I do not agree with all the details and dimensions of Hodges' picture, at least the picture shows the booth placed center stage and illustrates the vastly better sight lines resulting from this arrangement.

There is one objection to placing the booth in front of one of the tiring house doors: how then does one account for such stage directions as "thrust out"? If the booth is available, why are properties projected forward when they could have as easily been discovered? Some critics supporting the alcove theory, which is subject to this same objection, have argued that "thrust out" meant to place a property in position on the rear stage. Needless to say, "thrust out" is even more appropriate when placing a property in position inside a booth. However, interpretation of stage directions is full of hazards. If a booth is not required in a particular play, the property could be simply "thrust out" through a stage door. If the curtains of the booth were not used or were already open, the property could be "thrust out" into the

open booth. If the curtains were closed in preparation for a discovery, the property could be "thrust out" through another door, or, indeed, through the closed curtains themselves if the scene would be better played even further down stage. In short, "thrust out" fits the booth more ways than it does the alcove.

The second problem of this chapter is the question of action aloft. Two possible spaces are available - the balcony and the top of the booth. In chapter I, it was determined that the balcony might be anywhere from six to twelve feet above stage level. If the balcony were twelve feet high there must have been some inconvenience in ascent and descent; therefore, a roofed booth six feet high would be most helpful in these cases. However, a balcony of twelve feet coupled with a booth of six feet leaves the problem of providing some way for the actor to enter on the top of the booth. The only solution is a ladder or steps of some sort as a permanent part of the framework. The second possibility, a balcony only six feet above stage level, coupled with a booth of the same height removes the necessity of a ladder or steps, for the actors need only to walk from the balcony to the roof of the booth.[2] At this point my reader might very well say, "I can see the justification for a booth if the balcony is twelve feet high, but is it really necessary if the balcony is only six feet high?" My answer is that in most cases the producers probably did not bother erecting the booth.

That is, a roofed booth is not necessary for a few lines by one or two actors in a given play, and the balcony would serve quite well in this case. However, there remain a few scenes which seem entirely unsuited to the balcony itself, for they involve sustained action aloft.[3] Needless to say such scenes would be best played as near center stage as possible and not tucked way in a balcony. As these scenes are very infrequent, and most are lacking in authority then perhaps, after all, action "above" on the booth is best reserved for those occasions when the balcony is too high for convenient ascent and descent.

There is one more problem to be considered: how could spectators in the balcony (as shown in the DeWitt drawing) see the action if a closed booth were used? Of course there is great critical debate over whether or not spectators did sit in the balcony, but even if they did, an arrangement of jutting tiring house and small booth provides an unimpeded view for all spectators. A shifting of the chairs (crowding would presumably be out of the question for spectators important enough to sit in the balcony) to either side of the balcony (facing center stage) would provide a fine view of the booth's interior.

Perhaps the best argument for the booth is its feasibility. While theatre experimenters have found the recess singularly ineffective in actual practice, they have nothing but praise for the booth. "The Oregon Shakespeare Festival, at Ashland, placing it before the

inner stage and with its roof a practicable playing area on a level with the gallery has found it in recent summers so convenient and effective that the directors have used it in the new theatre as a permanent (but still removable) part of the stage furnishings."[5] Upon this happy note I close my paper.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER ONE

[1]C. Walter Hodges, The Globe Restored (New York, 1954), pp. 121-122.

[2]Hodges, p. 127.

[3]E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, II (London, 1961), 360-361.

[4]Hodges, p. 26.

[5]Hodges, p. 154.

[6]Hodges, p. 38.

[7]George F. Reynolds, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays (London, 1940), pp. 44-46 and 109.

[8]Ashley H. Thorndike, Shakespeare's Theatre (New York, 1935), p. 71.

[9]Reynolds, p. 74.

[10]Hodges, pp. 187-193.

[11]Hodges, p. 188.

[12]Hodges, p. 191.

[13]Thorndike, p. 81.

[14]Harley Granville-Barker, "The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouses and Pre Restoration Stage Studies," RES, IV (1928), 233.

[15]Alfred Harbage, Theatre for Shakespear (Canada, 1955), p. 31.

[16]George F. Reynolds, "Some Problems of Elizabethan Staging," The University of Colorado Studies, XXVI (November, 1941), 7.

[17]Reynolds, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays, p. 49.

[18]Reynolds, pp. 42-43. For other examples see Reynolds, pp. 43-45, and Richard Hosley, "The Gallery over the Stage in the Public Playhouses of Shakespeare's Time," SQ, VIII (1957), 18, for instances from The Rape of Lucrece, 3 Henry VI, and John A Kent and John A Cumber.

[19]Reynolds, pp. 43.

[20]Glynne Wickham, Early English Stages, II (New York, 1963), pp. 153-205.

[21]Richard Southern, The Open Stage (London, 1953), p. 16.

[22]For examples from other countries see Southern, p. 17 and Hodges, The Globe Restored, pp. 134-35.

[23]Wickham, p. 339.

[24]Leslie Hotson, Shakespeare's Wooden O (London, 1960), p. 219.

[25]Allardyce Nicholl, The Development of the Theatre (New York, 1966), p. 96.

[26]R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert, Henslowe's Diary (London, 1961), pp. 319-321.

[27]Leslie Hotson has brought to light some interesting documents purporting to show that plays were commonly given away from these doors; that is, the stage was normally set in the middle of the hall with four sided viewing by the audience. His main proof is the records of the Office of Works, but in every case the production is either at court or in a private hall on a special occasion at which important personages, usually royalty, are present. On these occasions it is entirely fitting that a special effort be made and that these nobles be placed in a special conspicuous position, but to argue that this is ordinarily the case shows, I think, the danger of arguing from a more or less isolated instance. Finally, even Hotson admits the existence of some sort of structure with doors at stage level at one end of the public stage; however, he insists on calling it a property dock. For more on this see Shakespeare's Wooden O, pp. 145-164.

[28]Wickham, p. 199.

[29]George F. Kernodle, From Art to Theatre (Chicago, 1944), p. 133.

[30]Reynolds, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays, p. 109.

[31]Chambers, III, 292.

[32]Chambers, III, 483.

[33]Chambers, IV, 7.

[34]Chambers, III, 487.

[35]Chambers, IV, 46.

[36]Hodges, p. 192.

[37]Hodges, p. 187.

[38]Wickham, PLATE VI, No. 9.

[39]Wickham, p. 332.

[40]James A. H. Murry, ed., The Oxford English Dictionary (New York, 1888), p. 680.

[41]See Hodges p. 188 for a reconstruction of the Fortune which places some groundlings twenty-eight feet from the down stage edge of stage twenty-seven feet deep.

[42]Hodges, p. 134.

[43]John Cranford Adams, The Globe Playhouse: Its Design and Equipment (New York, 1961), pp. 113-123.

[44]Chambers, II, 528.

[45]Chambers, III, 484-485.

[46]William Poel, Some Notes on Shakespeare's Stage and Plays (London, 1916), p. 17.

[47]Warren Smith, "Evidence of Scaffolding on Shakespeare's Stage," RES, New Series II (1951), 22-29.

[48]Wickham, p. 301.

[49]I feel that sight lines are of definite importance in a study of the Elizabethan public stage. Notice that in both sides of the Swan drawing the lowest gallery is considerably above the stage. If sight lines are not important, why are these spectators placed in a position so that they may see over the heads of the groundling? Similarly, both the Fortune and the Hope call for the gallery to be built at least twelve feet off ground. Unless the Swan drawing is totally inaccurate, and unless the owners of the Fortune and the Hope were content to waste large amounts of expensive materials, it seems to me impossible not to conclude that the reason for this elevation of the lowest gallery is so that the spectators in these boxes could see. Furthermore, the sheer vanity of actors and the spectacle that is a part of the typical Elizabethan play must be taken into account.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER TWO

[1]A full list of stage directions calling for a curtain is given by Ashley H. Thorndike in Appendix I of his Shakespeare's Theatre (New York, 1935), although this list would be more helpful if he also gave the place of production.

[2]E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, III (London, 1961), 59.

[3]William Archer and W. J. Lawrence, "The Playhouse," Shakespeare's England, II (London, 1926), 303.

[4]Chambers, II, 539.

[5]Chambers, III, 83.

[6]Charlotte C. Stopes, "Elizabethan Stage Scenery," The Fortnightly Review, LXXXI (1951), 1113.

[7]Thomas Dekker, The Gull's Hornbook, ed. R. B. McKerrow (London, 1904), p. 52.

[8]Thorndike, pp. 77-79.

[9]Charles Tyler Prouty, "An Early Elizabethan Playhouse," ShS, VI (1953), 65.

[10]Prouty, p. 71

[11]Richard Hosley, "The Gallery over the Stage in the Public Playhouse of Shakespeare's Time," SQ, VIII (1957), 16.

[12]Robert Greene, Alphonsus, King of Aragon, ed. W. W. Greg (London, 1926), p. viii.

[13]Dekker, p. 50.

[14]Dekker, pp. 52-54.

[15]C. Walter Hodges, "Unworthy Scaffolds: A Theory for the Reconstruction of Elizabethan Playhouses," ShS, III (1950), 83.

[16]Prouty, p. 69.

[17]George F. Reynolds, "Two conventions of the Open Stage," PQ, XLI (1962), 82-83.

[18]Bernard Miles and Josephine Wilson, "Three Festivals at the Mermaid Theatre," SQ, V (1954), 310.

[19]G. H. Cowling, "Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Stage," A Series of Papers on Shakespeare and the Theatre (London, 1927), p. 175.

[20]Glynne Wickham, Early English Stages, II (New York, 1963), 284.

[21]C. Walter Hodges, The Globe Restored (New York, 1954), p. 60.

[22]William Shakespeare, Pericles, The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare, ed. E. F. Hoeniger (London, 1963), p. 138.

[23]The balance of the authority, the names of the Actors on the platt itself, points toward the platt representing a public performance either at the Theatre or the Rose. See Chambers, ~~II,~~ 121-125 for more on this. However, there is a slim possibility of private performance. See Chambers III, 497 for additional data.

[24]Hodges, The Globe Restored, p. 182.

[25]There is an interesting use of a tent in Troilus and Cressida for which the authority is quite good. However, the stage direction itself is very confusing and it is possible that it was written in terms of some sort of stage effect. See Wickham, p. 319 for more on this stage direction.

[26]Chambers, III, 330, lists it as registered in 1594 and first published in 1598. The title page of this first publication reads in part, "as it hath been sundrie times publikely plaid." However, an author's hand (Robert Greene, who was not a theatrical man) can be seen in some stage directions; thus, the direction may or may not reflect actual staging practice.

[27]Wickham, p. 318.

[28]Wickham.

[29]Chambers, III, 483, lists Quarto one, from which this stage direction is taken, as published in 1597 and reproduces the title page which reads in part: "As it hath been often (with great applause) plaid publicuely."

[30]William Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, Parallel Texts of the First Two Quoatos, ed. P. A. Daniel, published for The New Shakespeare Society, Ser. 2 no. 1 (London, 1874),

[31]George F. Reynolds, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays (London, 1940), p. 135.

[32]Reynolds, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays, p. 5.

[33]Reynolds, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays, p. 135.

[34]Chambers, III, 421-422, lists this play as registered on August 14, 1590 and published later that same year. The title page indicates the strong possibility of public performance; it states, "as sundrie times shewed upon the Stages in the Citie of London, By the right honorable the Lord Admyrall, his seruants."

[35]Glynne Wickham, "Exeunt to the Cave-Notes on the Staging of Marlowe's Plays," TDR, VIII (1964), 191.

[36]Chambers, III, 364-365.

[37]Leslie Hotson, "Shakespeare's Arena," SR, LXI (1953), 358.

[38]A. M. Nagler, Shakespeare's Stage (New Haven, 1958), p. 37.

[39]Chambers, II, 364-365.

[40]Hotson, p. 357.

[41]Hodges, The Globe Restored, pp. 51-52.

[42]Wickham, Early English Stages, pp. 209-210.

[43]Wickham, Early English Stages, pp. 210-229.

[44]Leslie Hotson, Shakespeare's Wooden O (London, 1960), p. 219.

[45]Allardyce Nicholl, The Development of the Theatre (New York, 1966), p. 96.

[46]Wickham, Early English Stages, p. 310.

[47]William Archer, "The Elizabethan Stage," QR, CCVIII (1908), 456.

[48]Wickham, "Exeunt to the Cave," pp. 190-191.

[49]Chambers, III, 425-426.

[50]Chambers, III, 481, lists it as registered October 20, 1597, and Quarto one appeared that same year with the note on its title page "as it hath been lately acted by the Right honorable the Lord Chamberlain his seruants."

In volume two of his work, Chambers notes that Blackfriars (the only private theatre Shakespeare can be connected with) was closed by the Privy Council in 1596. Since the theatre did not reopen until 1600, we can be fairly sure that this is a public theatre play.

[51]Reynolds, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays, p. 36.

[52]Hotson, Shakespeare's Wooden O, pp. 126-129.

[53]"A Tell-Tale Print" (anon. rev.), The London Times, September 8, 1953, p. 2.

[54]Chambers, III, 71-72.

[55]Wickham, Early English Stages, p. 311.

[56]Wickham, Early English Stages.

[57]R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert, Henslowes Diary (London, 1961), pp. 319-321.

[58]W. F. Rothwell, "Was there a typical Elizabethan Stage," ShS, XII (1959), 18-19.

[59]Nagler, p. 45.

60 Foakes, p. 319.

[61]Chambers, III, 422.

[62]W. W. Greg, Henslowe's Diary II (London, 1908), 339.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER THREE

[1]C. Walter Hodges, The Globe Restored (New York, 1954), p. 176.

[2]This is not to say that a ladder or steps would never be used in this case, for some ascents and descents seem to have taken place in sight of the audience, and ladders are portrayed in some pictures of booths.

[3]For a full discussion of scenes involving action "above" see E. K. Chambers The Elizabethan Stage, III (London, 1961), 91-98. Most of the instances he cites lack the authority that one might wish; for instance, the authority for James IV is only fair (see chapter II, n. 26). However, Romeo and Juliet II.ii in the first quarto has good authority (see chapter II, n. 29), and it illustrates the kind of sustained action that would be poorly staged in an up stage balcony.

[4]See Hodges p. 176 again. Spectators in the balcony above the doors (curtained arches) can see the interior of the booth.

[5]G. F. Reynolds, "Two Conventions of the Open Stage," PQ, XLI (1961), 84.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, John C. "Shakespeare's Stage; New Facts and Figures," Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (1936), 812-818.

_____. The Globe Playhouse: Its Design and Equipment. New York, 1961.

Albright, Victor E. The Shakesperian Stage. London, 1909.

Archer, William. "Elizabethan Stage and Restoration Drama," QR, CCXLI (1924), 399-418.

_____. "The Elizabethan Stage," QR, CCVIII (1908), 442-471.

Archer, William and W. J. Lawrence. "The Playhouse," Shakespeare's England. II, London, 1926.

"A Tell-Tale Print," Anon. Rev., The London Times, September 8, 1953, p. 8.

Baker, George Pierce. The Development of Shakespeare as Dramatist. London, 1929.

Bradbrook, M. C. Elizabethan Stage Conditions. London, 1932.

_____. Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy. London, 1935.

Beckerman, Bernard. Shakespeare at the Globe, 1599-1609. New York, 1962.

Chambers, E. K. The Elizabethan Stage. 4 vols. London, 1923.

Corbin, John. "Shakespeare and the Plastic Stage," Atlantic Monthly, XCVII (1906), 369-383.

Cowling, G. H. "Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Stage," A Series of Papers on Shakespeare and the Theatre. . ., by members of the Shakespeare Association. London, 1927.

Dekker, Thomas. The Gull's Hornbook, ed. R. B. McKerrow. London, 1904.

Foakes, W. F. and R. T. Rickert. Henslowe's Diary. London 1961.

Granville-Barker, Harley. "A Note Upon Chapters XX. and XXI. of The Elizabethan Stage," RES, I (1925), 60-71.

_____. Prefaces to Shakespeare. 2 Vols. Princeton, 1947.

_____. "The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouses and Pre-Restoration Stage Studies," RES, IV (1928), 229-237.

_____. "The Stagecraft of Shakespeare," The Fortnightly Review, CXX (1926), 1-17.

Greene, Robert. Alphonsus King of Aragon, ed. W. W. Greg. London, 1926.

Gregg, W. W. Henslowe Papers. London, 1907.

Guthrie, Tyrone. "Shakespeare at Stratford, Ontario," ShS, VIII (1955), 127-131.

Hackett, Thomas. Fidele and Fortunio The Two Italian Gentlemen, The Malone Society Reprints. London, 1909.

Haines, C. M. "The Development of Shakespeare's Stagecraft," A Series of Papers on Shakespeare and The Theatre..., by Members of the Shakespeare Association. London, 1927.

Hale, Edward H. "The Influence of Theatrical Conditions on Shakespeare," MP, I (1903-04), 171-192.

Harbage, Alfred. Theatre for Shakespeare. Canada, 1955.

Hewett, Barnard. "Art and Theatre: George Fuchs," Elizabethan Studies and Other Essays, II (October, 1954), 357-362.

Hodges, C. Walter. The Globe Restored. (London, 1953) p. 49.

_____. "Unworthy Scaffolds! A Theory for the Reconstruction of Elizabethan Playhouses," ShS, III, (1950), 83-94.

Hosley, Richard. "The Discovery - Space in Shakespeare's Globe," ShS, XII (1959), 35-46.

_____. "The Gallery over the Stage in the Public Playhouse of Shakespeare's Time," SQ, VIII (1957), 15-31.

Hotson, Leslie. "False Faces on Shakespeare's Stage," TLS (May 1y, 1952), 336.

_____. "Shakespeare's Arena," SR LXI (1957), 347-361.

_____. Shakespeare's Wooden O. London, 1960.

_____. The First Night of Twelfth Night. London, 1954.

Kernodle, George R. From Art To Theatre. Chicago, 1944.

_____. "The Open Stage: Elizabethan or Existentialist?" ShS, VII (1959), 1-7.

Lawrence, William J. Pre-Restoration Stage Studies. Cambridge, U.S.A., 1927.

_____. The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies. New York, 1963.

Matthews, Brander. Shakespeare as a Playwright. New York, 1923.

McDowell, John H. "Conventions of Medieval Art in Shakespearian Staging," JEGP, XLVII (1948), 215-229.

Miles, Bernard and Josephine Wilson. "Three Festivals at the Mermaid Theatre," SQ, V (1934), 307-310.

Munday, Anthony. The Book of John A Kent and John A Cumber, The Malone Society Reprints, London, 1923.

Nagler, A. M. "Shakespeare's Arena Demolished," ShN, VI (February 1956), 7.

Nagler, A. M. Shakespeare's Stage. New York, 1958.

Nicholl, Allardyce. "Passing Over the Stage'," ShS, XII (1959), 47-55.

_____. "Studies in the Elizabethan Stage Since 1900," ShS, I (1948), 1-16.

_____. The Development of the Theatre. New York, 1966.

Ogilvie, Janet. "Heard 'Off': Stage Noises in the Elizabethan Theatre," English Review, XLV (1929), 67-77.

Poel, William. Some Notes on Shakespeare's Stage and Plays. London, 1960.

Prouty, Charles Tyler. "An Early Elizabethan Playhouse," ShS, VI (1953), 64-74.

Reynolds, George F. "Hamlet at the Globe," ShS, IX (1956), 49-53.

_____. "Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging," MP, II (1905), 581-614.

_____. "Some Problems of Elizabethan Staging," The University of Colorado Studies, XXVI (November, 1941), 3-19.

_____. "Staging Elizabethan Plays," Shakespeare Association Bulletin, XXIV (1949), 258-263.

Reynolds, George F. "The Return of the Open Stage," Essays On Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig. Columbia, 1962.

_____. The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull. New York, 1940.

_____. "'Trees' on the Stage of Shakespeare," MP, V (1907), 153-168.

_____. "Two Conventions of the Open Stage," PQ, XLI (1962), 82-95.

_____. "What We Know of the Elizabethan Stage," MP, IX (1911-12), 47-82.

Redley, M. R. Anthony and Cleopatra, The Arden Shakespeare. London, 1954.

Rothwell, W. F. "Was There A Typical Elizabethan Stage?" ShS, XII (1959), 15-21.

Saunders, J. W. "Staging at the Glove, 1599-1613," SQ, XI (1960), 401-426.

_____. "Vaulting the Rails," ShS, VII (1954), 69-81.

Shakespeare, William. Pericles, The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare, ed. E. D. Hoeniger. London, 1963.

Shakespeare, William. Pericles, by Shakespeare Quartos in Collotype Fascimile, ed. W. W. Greg. London, 1940.

Simpson, Percy. "Actors and Acting," Shakespeare's England. II. London, 1926.

Smith, Irwin. " 'Gates' on Shakespeare's Stage," SQ, VII (1956), 159-176.

Smith, Warren D. "Evidence of Scaffolding on Shakespeare's Stage," RES, New Series II (1951), 22-29.

_____. "Stage Business in Shakespeare's Dialogue," SQ, IV (1953), 311-316.

_____. "Stage Settings in Shakespeare's Dialogue," MP, L (1953), 32-35.

Southern, Richard. "On Reconstruction and Practicable Elizabethan Public Playhouse," ShS, XII (1959), 22-34.

_____. "The Contribution of the Interludes to Elizabethan Staging," Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig. Columbia, 1962.

_____. The Open Stage. London, 1953.

Spencer, Theodore. Death and Elizabethan Tragedy. London, 1936.

Stopes, Charlotte C. "Elizabethan Stage Scenery," The Fortnightly Review, LXXXI (1907), 1107-1117.

Styan, J. L. "The Actor at the Foot of Shakespeare's Platform," ShS, XII (1959), 56-63.

Thorndike, Ashley H. Shakespeare's Theater. New York, 1935.

Wickham, Glynne. Early English Stages: 1300-1660. II. New York, 1963.

_____. "Exeunt to the Cave-Notes on the Staging of Marlowe's Plays," TDR, VIII (1964), 184-194.

VITA

Joseph Robert Little was born in Philadelphia on June 2, 1942. He was the only child of Robert and Bernice Little. He attended Lansdale Catholic High School and then entered LaSalle College. He graduated cum laude from LaSalle College in 1964 and entered Lehigh University later that same year. He is presently teaching twelfth grade English and coaching the Rifle Team at Quakertown Community Senior High School.